



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,938	10/21/2005	Jeffry D. Watkins	X-16760A	8652
25885	7590	09/18/2008	EXAMINER	
ELI LILLY & COMPANY			SCHWADRON, RONALD B	
PATENT DIVISION			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 6288			1644	
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/18/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[patents@lilly.com](mailto:patents@lilly.com)

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/553,938	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WATKINS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 34-48 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 34-39 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
  - 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
  - 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/21/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
  - 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and the species AME 33 in the reply filed on 6/29/08 and 2/29/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that are stated. This is not found persuasive because of the following reasons. Regarding applicants comments about the cited prior art reference and lack of unity, said comments are addressed below in the prior art rejection cited below. Regarding applicants comments, in the event that the product claims are indicated as allowable, pertinent method claims which recite use of said products will be rejoined as per MPEP 821.04.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 40-47 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction requirement in the reply filed on 6/29/08 and 2/29/08.

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 34-39,48 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 52-54,56,57,59-61 of copending Application No. 11/572634. Although the conflicting claims are not

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because whilst the two sets of antibodies/compositions differ in scope (the antibodies of 11/572634 contain specific Fc region mutants), both sets of claims encompass use of the same VH and VL (aka the antibody of claim 35/48) which binds CD20. The various functional properties of the claims are inherently found in said antibodies.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 34-39,48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Business Wire.

The Business Wire reference discloses the antiCD20 antibody AME-133 (aka AME 33) which is produced by AME (the same company as the applicant of the instant invention as disclosed on parent PCT US04/15786, see 371 documents filed in the instant application). Said antibody appears to have the same properties as the claimed antibodies (see page 2 wherein said antibody is a humanized optimized antiCD20 antibody with superior affinity and killing of tumor cells in comparison to RITUXAN). The amino acid sequence of said antibody is an inherent property of said antibody. The antibody would have been present in a solution (aka a composition).

Regarding applicants comments about authorship and availability of the instant antibody, the MPEP section 716.01(c) [R-2] states:

>II. < ATTORNEY ARGUMENTS CANNOT TAKE THE PLACE OF  
EVIDENCE

*The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965).*

There is no evidence of record that the antibody referred to in the Business Wire reference was not publicly available. In addition, see page 3 of said reference which indicates a public disclosure of said antibody. In addition, the publication is authored by "Business Wire", not applicant.

7. No claim is allowed.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen O'Hara can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ron Schwadron, Ph.D./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644